



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
WWW.USPTO.GOV

Paper No. None

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
130 WOODBURY ROAD  
WOODBURY NY 11797

**COPY MAILED**

JUL 17 2006

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of :  
Hung-Yang Chang et al. :  
Application No. 10/624,861 :  
Filed: July 11, 2003 : DECISION ON PETITION  
Attorney Docket No. : UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.181(A)  
YOR920030197US1 (8728-627 :  
Title: SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR :  
MONITORING AND CONTROLLING :  
BUSINESS LEVEL SERVICE LEVEL :  
AGREEMENTS :  
:

This is a decision on the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181(a) to withdraw the holding of abandonment, filed on April 13, 2006.

BACKGROUND

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the non-final Office action, mailed July 28, 2005, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three (3) months. No response was received, and no extensions of time under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) were requested. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on October 29, 2005. A notice of abandonment was mailed on February 14, 2006.

RELEVANT PORTION OF THE MPEP

MPEP §711.03(c) states, in part:

PETITION TO WITHDRAW HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT BASED ON FAILURE TO RECEIVE OFFICE ACTION

In *Delgar v. Schulyer*, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), the court decided that the Office should mail a new Notice of Allowance in view of the evidence presented in support of the contention that the applicant's representative did not receive the original Notice of Allowance. Under the reasoning of *Delgar*, an allegation that an Office action was never received may be considered in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment. If adequately supported, the Office may grant the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment and remail the Office action. That is, the reasoning of *Delgar* is applicable regardless of whether an application is held abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee (35 U.S.C. 151) or for failure to prosecute (35 U.S.C. 133).

To minimize costs and burdens to practitioners and the Office, the Office has modified the showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office action. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner stating that the Office communication was not received by the practitioner and attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office communication was not received. A copy of the docket record where the nonreceived Office communication would have been entered had it been received and docketed must be attached to and referenced in practitioner's statement. For example, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. See Notice entitled "Withdrawing the Holding of Abandonment When Office Actions Are Not Received," 1156 O.G. 53 (November 16, 1993).

The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the Office action may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the Office action was lost in the mail (e.g., if the practitioner has a history of not receiving Office actions).

Evidence of nonreceipt of an Office communication or action (e.g., Notice of Abandonment or an advisory action) other than that action to which reply was required to avoid abandonment would not warrant withdrawal of the holding of abandonment. Abandonment takes place by operation of law for failure to reply to an Office action or timely pay the issue fee, not by operation of the mailing of a Notice of Abandonment. See *Lorenz v. Finkl*, 333 F.2d 885, 889-90, 142 USPQ 26, 29-30 (CCPA 1964); *Krahn v. Commissioner*, 15 USPQ2d 1823, 1824 (E.D. Va 1990); *In re Application of Fischer*, 6 USPQ2d 1573, 1574 (Comm'r Pat. 1988).

Two additional procedures are available for reviving an application that has become abandoned due to a failure to reply to an Office Action: (1) a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) based upon unavoidable delay; and (2) a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) based on unintentional delay.

See also 1156 O.G. 53 (October 25, 1993), which may be viewed at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/og/con/files/cons074.htm>

ANALYSIS

With the present petition, Petitioner has alleged that the mailing was not received. Petitioner has failed to state that he

searched both the file jacket and the docket records, and has failed to include a copy of the latter. However it is clear that a change of correspondence address crossed in the mail (the submission was received on July 29, 2005), and the non-final Office action was returned as undeliverable.

CONCLUSION

Considering the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue, as set forth on petition, it is concluded that petitioner has met his burden of establishing that the mailing was not received.

Accordingly, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181(a) is **GRANTED**. The holding of abandonment is **WITHDRAWN**.

The Technology Center will be notified of this decision. The Technology Center's support staff will re-mail the non-final action of July 28, 2005, and will set a new period for response.

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225. All other inquiries concerning examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.

The Change of Correspondence Address has been entered and made of record.



Paul Shanoski  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions  
United States Patent and Trademark Office